

Modern day Salafī's and the Madhab of the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah of the past.



@anonymous · 42m

+ 0

- 0

☆ 0

...

From the archives of theAkh: Abu Bakr at-Tarabulsi (may Allah keep him safe)

This is a really detailed article about the Murji'ah, and it will prove that many modern day "Salafī's" are infact upon the Madhab of the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah, it will outline the main deviances of the Murji'ah of our time with proof, and give a good explanation on who are these Murji'ah, beneficial background information and many narrations from the Salaf regarding them and their evil. I have translated the article from the Lectures of Shaykh Turkī (رحمه الله) while adding some additional notes, May Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) make it beneficial to those who read it.

Now, just to give you all a brief summary of some of the characteristics and deviances of the Murji'ah of our time, you must know that the Murji'ah of our time have many characteristics which agree with the Khawārij of the past, among the biggest trait they have taken is "Being soft with the Kuffār and harsh against the Muslims", such as crying day and night for the Mushrikīn and Apostates, while speaking against & condemning the Muwahhīdīn and the best of the Muslims with the worst of names and labels. They apply the verses that were revealed upon the Kuffār over the Muslims, and they have even gone further than the Khawārij of the past and applied the Verses upon the Muslims over the Kuffār.

The Murji'ah of our time deny the Ijmā' of the Muslims frequently, such as the following Consensus's of the Scholars, and try their best to distort the statements of the Scholars and even lie against them to correct their beliefs, among the consensus's that they go against and distort are:

1) The consensus of the Salaf regarding the one who replaces the Sharī'ah of Allāh with man-

made laws; Believing that legislating manmade laws, complete abstinence from ruling by the Shari'ah, or resisting to rule by the Shari'ah, seeking judgement from Tāghūt, are all just minor Kufr, that do not exit the doer from the religion of Islām, except with Istihlāl. Istihlāl is to believe his sin to be permissible. So they make the sins of major Kufr and major Shirk equal to lesser sins like adultery, drinking alcohol, etc., by placing the condition of Istihlāl on the major Kufr, which only exists as a condition for minor Kufr.

2) The consensus of the Salaf which was quoted by Imām Ibn Hajr (رحمه الله) in Fath al-Bārī & others regarding the Obligation of revolting against the Kāfir or Apostate ruler. Today they say, even if he's a Kāfir, do not revolt against him. Exaggerating the concept of excuse due to ignorance with regards to the rulers even if they pronounced their Istihlāl of their legislating man-made laws, they will always find an excuse for the rulers to go against the Consensus of the Ummāh. This point on revolting against the rulers will be discussed in further detail Inshā'Allāh.

3) The consensus of the Salaf which was quoted by Imām Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalī (رحمه الله) in Jāmi' al-'Ulūm wal-Hikam & others, the Ijmā' of the Salaf that being forced in harming other muslims such as killing them & similar to this isn't considered 'ikrāh' [coercion]. Now, they have abolished this Ijmā' as well, and one of the worst crimes that certain groups amongst Murji'ah have made is justifying spying against the Muslimīn for the Kuffār and harming the Muslims to assist the Kuffār, and this is Apostasy from the religion, Walā Hawla Walā Quwata ilā Billāh.

4) The consensus of the Salaf in the Apostasy of supporting and assisting the Kuffār against the Muslims; Believing that major Walā' (alliance/friendship) with the Kuffār is not major Kufr, unless the person internalises a Kufr intention, such as wishing to aid the religion of Kufr, or to destroy Allāh's Religion, etc. So if one were to lead the crusade against Islām, head it, support it by wealth and blood, he would still be a Muslim, until he pronounces the internalised intentions of Kufr. So they do not make the act itself Kufr, until this innovated condition is proven.

5) They reject the consensus that was mentioned by Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyāh (رحمه الله) pertaining the permissibility of attacking the enemies/criminals who take innocents as human shields. Burdening, i.e. making it extremely difficult and condemning the Muwāhhideen, saying such and such is completely Harām etc... They also innovate false conditions to defend Muslim Land, such as saying "You must have permission from the ruler".

What is the secret behind why the Murji'ah have been welcomed by the Scholars and the

Masses? Ibn Kathīr (رحمه الله) narrates from the path of Ibn ‘Asākir (رحمه الله) in al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah(10/276) that Al-Ma'mūn asked what is Irjā'? Al-Nadhr Ibn Shumayl (رحمه الله) who is one of the Imāms of the Muslims replied: "Irjā' is a religion that agree's with the rulers, they gain from the Dunyā with it, and lose from their religion", he (i.e. The ruler Al-Ma'mūn) said “you have stated the truth”. That's why the Murji'ah are widespread in gatherings & the mosques, because the rulers love them, so don't be surprised if you see the official stance of the governments & their opinions in agreement with the Murji'ah.

- Why were they called Murji'ah, it's because they went too extreme in hope, unlike the Khawārij who went too extreme in fear. As Imām Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمه الله) said: “Verily the Muslim is like a Bird, his head is Mahabbāh (Love of Allāh), and one of his wings is fear (i.e. From Allāh and his punishments), and the other wing is hope (i.e. Hope of the forgiveness/pardoning of Allāh and hope of what Allāh has promised for the believers, righteous etc..)”. So we do not give dominance to one wing over the other, because a bird cannot fly with 1 wing, the Khawārij know that Allāh is severe in punishment, yet they forgot that Allāh is the most merciful and most forgiving, whereas in opposition to them, the Murji'ah took “The Most Merciful and Forgiving” and abandoned “Severe in Punishment”, but Ahlal Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah are balanced in the middle, they took both matters together, they know that Allāh is severe in Punishment and know that Allāh is the most merciful and forgiving. So this is one of the reasons why they were called Murji'ah, however this is the weaker view.

The correct reason why they were called Murji'ah is because Irjā' in the Arabic Language means To Delay/Postpone, as Allāh said about Fir'awn and his: “They said, "Postpone [the matter of] him and his brother and send among the cities gatherers” [7:111], they are referring to Mūsa (عليه السلام) and his brother Hārūn (عليه السلام). And Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) says: “And [there are] others {deferred} until the command of Allah - whether He will punish them or whether He will forgive them. And Allah is Knowing and Wise.” [9:106]

So Irjā' means to delay/postpone, and the Reason why they were called “Murji'ah” is because they postponed/separated actions to be from Ēmān, and they didn't include Actions within the reality of Ēmān, and the Murji'ah are divided into 5 deviant sects:

1) Murji'at al-Fuqahā', these are the least in deviation, they defined Ēmān as Speech & Belief, however they agree with Ahlal Sunnah in making Takfīr upon whoever commits a nullifier of Islām, how so? According to Ahlal Sunnah, whenever a Muslim falls into a nullifier of Islām, they make Takfīr upon him with the correct guidelines in the Sharī'ah based upon that nullifier he committed. As for Murji'at al-Fuqahā', they make Takfīr upon him as well, however they don't

make Takfīr upon him because he committed that nullifier, rather they say, this act of Kufr which this individual committed indicates the Kufr within his Heart, so the end result, they made Takfīr upon whoever committed an act of Kufr, but they based this upon the Kufr within his Heart, because this act of kufr shows to us that he is a Kāfir in his heart, even if he claimed otherwise.

Important Note about Murji'at al-Fuqahā': Whoever says “Musayhif” (i.e. Little Mus-haf, it's sort of a belittling way of saying Mus-haf) or “Musayjid” (i.e. Little Masjid, it's sort of a belittling way of saying Masjid), has disbelieved according to the Hanafī's (the majority of whom are from the Murji'at al-Fuqahā'). Also whoever prays intentionally without Wudū' has disbelieved according to the Hanafī's, so they included nullifiers of Islām that the Majority of the Scholars didn't include as nullifiers.

So even though they were mistaken in defining Ēmān, except that it comes to applying it upon the incidents, realities and specific individuals, they agree with Ahl al sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, unlike the Murji'ah of our time who do not make Takfīr upon whoever commits an act of Kufr, unless he believes that act to be permissible in his heart, and the Murji'at al-Fuqahā' applied the rulings of Takfīr upon individuals correctly, unlike the Irjā' of going into exaggeration in completely separating between “general” and applying it “specifically” upon the individuals, so those people who say this is Kufr in “general”, but don't apply it upon anyone, so they see the act as Kufr, but don't see anyone as a Kāfir, whereas by principle in the Clear Major Kufr and Clear Major Shirk, the ruling is applied upon the individual according to the correct guidelines of Ahl al Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah. Unlike the Unclear Matters that require removal of misconceptions until the ruling is applied upon the individual, but due to this Irjā', they do not differentiate between the two and consider everything “unclear” or even if it's clear cut, they still won't apply it, especially on the rulers, wherein millions of excuses are made.

We have the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah who are two types:

2) The first type: Jahmiyyah, the Salaf refer to them as the Ghulāt among the Murji'ah, how do these Jahmiyyah define Ēmān? They say “Ēmān is acquaintance (ma'rifah)”, whoever knows Allāh (in his heart), he's a believer. Whatever he does of the Mukaffirāt or Nawāqidh al-Islam [Nullifiers of Islām], he's still a believer, the most important thing is to know Allāh to become a believer. The Shaykh of this misguided sect is “al-Jahm ibn Safwān”, these Jahmiyyah say this corrupt statement pertaining Ēmān. What is given off from their corrupt statement is that Iblīs is not a Kāfir, because Iblīs as some of our contemporary Mashāyikh have said: “If Iblīs had a state today, we would find from the Murji'ah of our time who would place a patch for him (i.e. Cover his Kufr), and affiliate him to Islam”. How so? Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) said about Iblīs: {He said, "My Lord, then reprieve me until the Day they are resurrected."} [15:36].

So Iblīs believes in the Rubūbiyyāh of Allāh, he believes in day of resurrection, calls upon Allāh without an intermediary. Therefore Iblīs believed in some of the matters, however he disbelieved due to his rejection and arrogance.

But based upon the view of the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah, i.e. the Jahmiyyah, their speech necessitates that Iblīs didn't disbelieve. And their speech also necessitates that Fir'awn and his nation are from the people of Ēmān, because Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) said about them: {And they rejected them, while their [inner] selves were convinced thereof, out of injustice and haughtiness. So see how was the end of the corrupters.} [27:14].

So Fir'awn and his people, when they rejected (the truth) by their speech and actions, but deep down in their hearts, they recognise true Ēmān and affirm it.

So what necessitates from the speech of the Jahmiyyāh is that Fir'awn is a Believer, their speech also necessitates affirming Ēmān for the Jews, as Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) said: {Those to whom We gave the Scripture know him as they know their own sons. But indeed, a party of them conceal the truth while they know [it].} [2:146]

Meaning, the Jews know that the Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is upon The Haqq and Sidq, however they went against him. So it's necessary for the Jahmiyyah to affirm Ēmān for the Jews, and likewise affirm Ēmān for the Mushrikīn! As Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) said: {And indeed, they do not call you untruthful} [6:33]

So based upon the words of the Jahmiyyāh, that the Mushrikīn who the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought are considered from the people of Ēmān. They must also affirm the Ēmān of Abū Tālib because he said: "And I know that your Dīn (i.e. Muhammād) is from the best religions out there"

So the speech of the Jahmiyyah necessitates affirming Ēmān for all those we mentioned, and that is why large numbers from the Scholars of the Salaf made Takfīr upon Ghulāt al-Murji'ah, among those who were from them, Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Imam Wakī' Ibn al-Jarrāh (رحمه الله) who is the Shaykh of Imām al-Shāfi'ī (رحمه الله) & Imām Ahmad (رحمه الله), also Imām Nāfi' (رحمه الله) and Imām Abū 'Ubayd (رحمه الله), and many others, they made Takfīr upon the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah, the Jahmiyyāh.

3) The second type: After the Jahmiyyah [who we just mentioned], from the Ghulat al-Murji'ah, we have the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah from the Ashā'irah and Māturīdiyyah and those who adopted their statements. How do they define Ēmān? They say: "Ēmān is Tasdīq

(affirmation in the heart alone)”, so a person doesn’t become a Kāfir unless he declares it Halāl from his heart or rejects it in his heart, as for other than that, no matter how many nullifiers and acts of kufr he commits, he won’t disbelieve. This is according to the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah from the Ashā’irah and Māturīdiyyah etc...

4) The Karrāmiyyāh, and these people have the most absurd kind of falsehood, they say Ēmān is “Speech alone” even if he doesn’t believe in his heart or do actions by his limbs, and this necessitates calling the Munāfiqīn “Believers” since they say on their tongues what is not in their hearts, and this absolutely falsifies the Madhab of the Karrāmiyyāh, so unlike the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah who say “Ēmān is only in the heart”, the Karrāmiyyāh say “Ēmān is only on the tongue”, so those Hypocrites who openly claim to be Muslims are True Believers according to them, because whatever is on the heart doesn’t effect Ēmān at all.

5) The most evil and filthiest type of Murji’ah are the Murji’ah of our time, because they claim to follow the Madhab of the Salaf, claiming their Irjā’ is the same methodology as the Salaf, decieving the general masses, whereas in reality, they have the beliefs of the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah, so these people are the filthiest of sects, why? Because they teach and deceive people in the name of the Salaf, we’ll prove this:

This book (i.e. That the shaykh displays) is published and written by “The counsel of Senior Scholars” the Lajnah al-Dā’imah (i.e The Standing Committee) not the “Khawarij” or “Takfiri’s” [like they call us], this book is for “The counsel of Senior Scholars”, the title of the book is ***“Al-Tah’tih min al-Irjā’ wa Ba’dh al-Kutub al-Dā’iyat ilayh”, i.e. “Warning against Irjā’ and some of the books that call towards it”***, I will mention 1 scenario: On page 26, they mentioned the books of ‘Ali al-Halabi who is among the heads of the murji’ah of our time, they wrote an introduction, then said about this Murji’ who claims to be a Salafī, they mention:

1. “The author based it (i.e. His book) upon the Madhab of the false innovated Murji’ah, who restrict Kufr to Juhūd (denial), Takthīb (belying) and Istihlāl al-Qalbī (declaring it lawful in the heart)”.

2. “Distorting the words of Ibn Kathīr (رحمه الله) in al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah, where he (i.e. ‘Alī al-Halabī) mentioned in his Hāshiyah (i.e. Footnotes) on page 15, quoting Ibn Kathīr (incorrectly) that Gengis Khān claimed that the Yāsiq is from Allāh, and this is the reason why they disbelieved!”, so this is the reason why the Tatār disbelieved according to this Murji’, he falsely attributes this to Ibn Kathīr (رحمه الله) that this Yāsiq (i.e. The Kufr constitution they ruled by in contradiction to the Qur’ān and Sunnah) comes from Allāh, so the Murji’ah today come along

and say “He doesn’t disbelieve for ruling by man-made laws unless he says this constitution is from Allāh”, and this is from the most absurd kind of falsehood. And the Counsel of Senior Scholars continued to say: “And when we returned back to the quoted area, what he attributed to Ibn Kathīr (رحمه الله) is not present!”

3. “Distorting the words of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, where he attributed to him, in his so called book, that replacing the hukm (of Allāh) is not Kufr according to Shaykh al-Islām, except if it was from acquaintance, belief in the heart, and Istihlāl (declaring it lawful); and this is pure distortion of the words of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمه الله), for he is a spreader of the madhab of the Salaf, Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah. And their Madhab (i.e. Regarding ‘Alī al-Halabī’s statement) as it was previously mentioned, that truly this is the Madhab of the Murji’ah!”

4. “Distorting the meaning of the words from the respected Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm in his book (Tahkīm al-Qawānīn al-Wad’iyyah), where he claimed (i.e. ‘Alī al-Halabī) in his so called compiled book, that the Shaykh (i.e. Muhammad Ibn Ibrāhīm who was the Muftī of Bilād al-Haramayn of the past) stipulates Istihlāl al-Qalbī (i.e. Declaring it lawful in the heart), despite the words of the Shaykh being clear like the clearness of the Sun in his titled Risālah (where he followed) upon the path of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah”.

~ End Quote from “al-Lajnah al-Dā’imah” (i.e. the Fatwas of the Standing Committee for Scholarly Research and Issuing Fatwas), the ones who certified and approved of this Fatwā were: Shaykh ‘Abdullāh Ibn ‘Abdul Rahmān al-Ghadayyān, Shaykh Bakr Ibn ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Ibn ‘Abdullāh Abū Zayd, Shaykh Sālih Ibn Fawzān al-Fawzān, and the Head (of the standing committee) is Shaykh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Ibn ‘Abdillāh Ibn Muhammad Āl al-Shaykh.

So these murji’ah, what do they do? They adorn themselves with the adornment of the Salaf al-Sālih falsely and deceitfully, then they say and consolidate the madhab of the Ghulat al-Murji’ah, who Imam al-Dhahabi described him as by saying: “*Ghulāt al-Murji’ah, Ghulāt al-Jahmiyyah, Ghulāt al-Karrāmiyyāh, they were unsettled by the Dunyā, and they became disbelievers*”, this is what he says in his time, so then what about during our time where Fitan is unsettled, where people are deaf, dumb and blind.

So we now say, what is ur proof O speaker [i.e. Shaykh referring to himself] to attribute them to the madhab of the Murji’ah, they say they are from the salaf, and they say that they’re spreading the madhab of the Salaf, so how can you claim that they are from the Murji’ah?

When they come and claim that we are from the Khawārij, we ask them for proof and mention to them the Usūl of the Khawārij (i.e. What is the Usūl of the Khawārij, prove we are from them). And we say to them if they refused or remained stubborn or acted arrogantly, we say to them what ‘Omar ibn ‘Abdūl ‘Azīz (رحمه الله) said, when he was informed about some of the Khawārij he said: *“Come to us, so we can have a debate with you”*, so whoever claims that we are from the Khawārij, we say to him, come to us and have a debate. So you can prove that we say and go by the Usūl [Principles] of the Khawārij, which they cannot prove.

However, we are able to prove with clear-cut undoubtable displayable evidence that they are from the Murji’ah, because the Murji’ah have 1 “Asl” [Principle], whoever says it, then he’s a Murji’! And it is separating actions from “Ēmān”, and shortly it will be proven that many of those who call themselves “Salafī” are infact upon the Madhab of the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah, since they say about the nullifiers of Islām “He only disbelieves if he makes it Halāl in his heart”, this person has excluded “actions” from Ēmān and Kufr!

Now, we say these [people] are Murji’ah, what is the proof for that? We will come to the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah, the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah who the head of them is Bishr al-Marīsī, they call them the Murji’ah al-Marīsīyyah, and the Murji’ah of our time are the closest in resemblance to the Murji’ah al-Marīsīyyah. They say “Nobody disbelieves except if he made Istihlāl or Jahada [denied the text]”, according to who? The Murji’ah al-Marīsīyyah.

1. Let us come towards these [modern day murji’ah], these people, some of them in definition and consolidation agree with the Salaf al-Sālih, so they define Ēmān as “Belief, Speech, and Actions”, some of the Murji’ah of our time give this definition, from the aspect of Talbīs [Deception] and Tadrīs [Mixing Truth with Falsehood].

2. And some of them in (defining it) agree with the Murji’ah al-Fuqahā’, they say “Ēmān is belief and speech, and actions aren’t included within Ēmān”.

3. And a third type of the Murji’ah of our time even in consolidation (i.e. Ta’sīl), they agree with the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah, so he defines Ēmān that it’s “Affirmation in the Heart alone”, such as ‘Abdul ‘Azīz al-Rayyis, and he quotes the statements of ‘Alī al-Halabī, who we mentioned earlier that the “Counsel of Senior Scholars” responded against. He says in some of his books, whoever prostrates to Budha or an idol or to the sun or the moon or the cross, if it was for worldly gain and intent, he doesn’t disbelieve, except if he makes it Halāl to do so in his heart (i.e. Istihlāl). This is the ‘Aqīdah of Jahm ibn Safwān, infact al-Jahm ibn Safwān makes Takfīr upon such a person, however he says: “This person didn’t do this, except that he doesn’t know about Allāh in his heart”, even al-Marīsī disagrees with them, so they surpassed their [Ghulāt

Murji'ah] shaykhs. Likewise this claimer (i.e. Al-Rayyis) says, that "Whoever kills one of the prophets of Allāh, he doesn't disbelieve except after all the conditions are fulfilled", and he mentions conditions which Allāh has never sent any proof for down. Ponder over this, whoever kills one of the Prophets of Allāh! This is how far they reached [in their Irjā'].

So the main point is that the Murji'ah of our time are of various types in definition and a consolidation, however in {application}, ALL of them agree with the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah.

Let us come to give 1 example, by examples, the statement will be clarified. Right now, when we say to them, define Ēmān to us, they say "Belief, Speech and Actions", and what is Kufr? Kufr is the opposite of Ēmān. So kufr would be, if he defined Ēmān like this according to Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, Major Kufr that takes one outside the fold of Islam can be by "Belief, Speech and Action", however during examination, investigation and precise scrutiny, it becomes clear that they restrict all the Mukaffirāt [Acts and Speech of Major Kufr] to Istihlāl [declaring lawful what's Harām] and Juhūd [denying] which both deal with the heart.

For e.g. We'll say to him, what do you say about the one who insults Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) and His Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he will say "Kafir", so we'll say to him, why did you make Takfīr upon him? He would say "I do not make Takfīr upon him, unless he declares it lawful to insult Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) and the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم)", so if you ask them "Is it Kufr to ally with the Kuffār against the Muslims?", they will say "It's only Kufr if he believes it's Halāl in his heart or 'loves' the religion of the Kuffār", so in reality he doesn't make Takfīr solely on the act or the saying (actions and speech), but he rather makes Takfīr due to I'tiqād (belief) and Juhūd (denial) which are limited/restricted to the heart. This is how the Early Ghulāt al-Murji'ah would do, they wouldn't make Takfīr upon anyone, except if he did Istihlāl or Juhūd.

So just to explain it more and more, there are Nawāqidh al-Ēmān (Nullifiers of faith) and there are Nawāqis al-Ēmān (Shortcomings of Faith), there are Mukaffirāt and there are Kabā'ir. And the Judgement upon these two matters, you have the Khawārij, and in contradiction to them, you have the Murji'ah, and in the middle you have Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah.

1) The Khawārij make Takfīr upon the one who commits Major Sins and Nullifiers of Islām, they make Takfīr upon them all, and they do not differentiate between the two, whether they made Istihlāl or not, all of them are declared Kuffār.

2) And in opposition to the Madhab of the Khawārij, the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah do not make Takfīr upon the one who commits Major Sins and Nullifiers of Islām, unless they made Istihlāl or

Juhūd [rejection/denial].

3) Ahlal Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah differentiate between the two matters:

- 1. With regards to Nawāqidh al-Islām, Ahlal Sunnah make Takfīr upon whoever commits a Nullifier of Islām according to the Guidelines of the Sharī'ah, whether he made Istihlāl or didn't make Istihlāl.
- 2. As for the Major Sins, then Ahlal Sunnah do not make Takfīr upon the one who commits major sins, except if he makes Istihlāl.

Now, we say to the Murji'ah of our time, what is the difference between the Major Sin and the Nullifier? And I asked this question to many of the Murji'ah, and they weren't able to answer it. Since you guys stipulate Istihlāl al-Qalbī for the nullifier and major sin, and by this it becomes apparent, that the only Nullifier for you is the Istihlāl al-Qalbī [declaring it lawful in the heart], and not insulting Allāh and the Messenger, or prostrating to an idol or shirk in Allāh etc...But rather it's declaring lawful these matters [i.e. nullifiers].

Therefore, the Murji'ah do not have anything that is from the Nullifiers of Islām, except for the Nawāqidh that are related to the Heart, which is “Juhūd” [i.e. Denial of the text] “Takthīb” [i.e. Belying the Qur'ān and Sunnāh] and “Istihlāl” [i.e. Declaring lawful what's been made Harām].

This is the short summary pertaining to the Madhab of the Murji'ah of our time, they say “We are upon the Madhab of Ahlal Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah”, we tell them “What's the difference between the Kabīrah (Major Sin) and the Nāqidh (Nullifier of Islam)?”.

You guys say, if a person who commits a Major Sin, he doesn't disbelieve unless he makes Istihlāl, and we agree with you in this. Then when we come towards the Nullifier [of Islam], you guys also say he doesn't disbelieve unless he makes Istihlāl, therefore you have made the Nawāqidh [Nullifiers of Islam] like the Kabā'ir [Major Sins], which doesn't take one outside the fold of Islam, except with “Belief in the heart”

That is why you find them doing explanations on books that talk about Apostasy and the Murtaddīn, and the Nawāqidh al-Islām such as the Risālah [Treatise] of Shaykh al-Mujaddid Muhammad ibn 'Abdul Wahhāb (رحمه الله). The murji'ah of our time dedicate themselves to quickly explain these Nawāqidh, why? This is not a Sharh [Explanation], rather it is restricting and placing constraints and obstacles, which no Hujjah or Proof has been sent by Allah, in relation to those Nawāqidh, therefore they are from the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah.

Likewise, whenever the Murji'ah of our times are asked about Takfīr upon the Tawāghīt,

Mushrikīn and Murtaddīn, they say “Allāh won’t ask you about it on the day of judgement” or “you are not responsible for them, you have nothing to do with them”, whereas Shaykh Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdul Wahhāb (رحمه الله) refutes this misconception of the Murji’ah. Al-Shaykh al-Mujaddid Muḥammād ibn ‘Abdīl Wahhāb (رحمه الله) says as it’s also mentioned in al-Durar al-Saniyyāh, the second volume, page 119, he says giving advice to his followers and students, so he says “Allāh Allāh my brothers, regarding the foundation of your religion”

Ponder over this, the foundation of your religion, it’s not a command from the Furū’ (branches) and it’s not a command from the Mustahabbāt or recommendations, he says:

“Allāh Allāh my brothers, regarding the foundation of your religion, bottom to head, firstly & lastly, and it is to bear witness that there’s no deity worthy of worship except Allāh and to know its meanings and to love its people and to make them your brothers, even if they were far away from you, and to hate the Tawāghit and disbelieve in the Tāghūt and to hate whoever loves them or argues on their behalf and doesn’t disbelieve in them or says, what do I have to do with them, or says Allāh hasn’t made me responsible for them, then this person has lied against Allāh & fabricated a big lie, rather Allāh has obligated upon him to disbelieve in them”

How many of the Murji’ah of our time say these words today, so he says “What do I have to do with them”, “Allāh hasn’t made me responsible for them”, “Is Allāh going to ask you on the day of judgement why you didn’t make takfeer upon Fulān & Fulānah?”, so Shaykh Muḥammād ibn ‘Abdūl Wahhāb (رحمه الله) says generally about those that say “What do I have to do with them, Allāh hasn’t made me responsible for them, then this person has lied against Allāh and fabricated a big lie, rather Allāh has obligated upon him to disbelieve in them”

I’ll show you all something of what the Salaf have said about the Murji’ah, there is so much quotes from them, but here is a few for you guys to understand the reality of the Murji’ah and be warned from them, even though most of these statements of the Salaf are directed to the least harmful Murji’ah, whom are the Murji’at al-Fuqahā’, so imagine the Ghulāt al-Murji’ah, and imagine the Murji’ah of our time.

It has been narrated from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), which was reported by Imām al-Tirmidhī (رحمه الله) on the Authority of Ibn ‘Abbās (رضي الله عنه) that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: “Two groups in my Ummāh have no Share in Islām, the Murji’ah and the Qadariyyah”, and the chain of narration has been spoken [negatively] about.

Imām al-Tabarānī (رحمه الله) and others reported on the authority of Mu’ādh ibn Jabal (رضي الله عنه), that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: “A warning against the Murji’ah has come from the

tongue of 70 Prophets”, and likewise the chain has been spoken [negatively] about.

Imām al-Tabarānī (رحمه الله) and others also narrated, which Al-Albānī (رحمه الله) mentioned in “Al Silsalati al-Sahīhah”, and al-Albānī said “Its chain is strong”, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: “Two groups of my Ummah will not come to me at the pond, the Qadariyyah and the Murji’ah”

Sa’īd Ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله), this righteous Imām, who is the student of Ibn ‘Abbas (رضي الله عنه), he passed away 95 AH, and all these quotes that you’re going to see here was narrated by Imām al-Lālakā’ī (رحمه الله), Imam Ibn Battah (رحمه الله), Imam ‘Abdillāh ibn al-Imām Ahmad (رحمه الله) and others:

Sa’īd Ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله) said: “The Murji’ah are the Jews of the Qiblah”, and once Sa’īd Ibn Jubayr was asked about the Murji’ah, so he replied: “The Jews!”, he’s speaking about the Murji’ah.

Imām Abū Ja’far Muhammad Ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Hussein (رحمه الله) said: “There is nothing in day or night more similar to the Jews than the Murji’ah”

And I say the basis for the Salaf comparing the Murji’ah to the Jews, is for several reasons, and the most prominent reason, is that the Jews said about the ruling of other than Allah was “Kufr duna Kufr” (i.e. Minor Kufr). You might ask, where is the proof for that?

Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) said in Āli ‘Imrān: “Do you not consider, [O Muhammad], those who were given a portion of the Scripture? They are invited to the Scripture of Allah that it should arbitrate between them; then a party of them turns away, and they are refusing.” [3:23]

What was their proof and justification for doing so? Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) says: “And they say, "Never will the Fire touch us, except for a few days." Say, "Have you taken a covenant with Allah ? For Allah will never break His covenant. Or do you say about Allah that which you do not know?" [2:80]

So based upon this, they say it’s Kufr Dūna Kufr, because the one who commits Major Sins will not eternally abide in the hellfire. So the Jews were the first ones to say that the ruling of other than what Allah revealed (in all of its forms) was Kufr Dūna Kufr.

Likewise, it has been narrated from Sa’īd ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله), that he said to one of his students (i.e. Ayyūb): “Did I not see you with Talq?!” he replied: “Yes, what’s wrong with him?”

he (i.e. Saʿīd ibn Jubayr) said: “Do not sit with him, for verily he is a Murjiʿ”

Do you guys know who Talq is? He is Talq Ibn Habīb, Ayyūb said: “I did not see anyone who worships Allāh more than him, or someone who is more obedient to his parents (than him)”, this is Talq ibn Habīb, yet the Imām warned from him because of his Irjāʿ.

Likewise Dhar Ibn ʿAbdillāh al-Hamadānī who I spoke about in the previous lesson, he is from the Murjiʿah, yet he revolted against al-Hajjāj with those who revolted [against al-Hajjāj], and on top of that, he gave Salām to Saʿīd ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله), yet he didn’t respond to his Salāms because of his Irjāʿ.

Imām Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī (رحمه الله) who passed away in the year 96AH, he says: “The Fitna of the Murjiʿah is greater than the Fitna of the Azāriqah”, and he says: “I fear for the Fitna of the Murjiʿah upon the religion of Islām more than the Azāriqah”

Do you guys know who are the Azāriqah? The Azāriqah are the worst sects of the Khawārij, they are the followers of Nāfiʿ ibn al-Azraq al-Khārijī, they are the most extreme sect among the Khawārij, yet Imām Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī sees that the Fitna of the Murjiʿah is greater than the Fitna of the Azāriqah.

And Likewise, Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī (رحمه الله) says “The Khawārij according to me are more excused than the Murjiʿah”

Therefore, do not become amazed when you know and realise that Imām al-Bukhārī (رحمه الله) the author of the “Sahīh”, he says: “I wrote from 1,000 Scholars, I did not write except from whoever says Ēmān is Speech and Actions, and I did not write from whoever says that Ēmān is Speech without Action”.

Ya’ni, even the Murjiʿat al-Fuqahāʾ [The least deviant Murjiʿ sect], Imām al-Bukhārī (رحمه الله) did not narrate Hadīth from them, however you will find him narrating from in his “Sahīh” which is the most Authentic Book after the Book of Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى), he narrated from who? He narrated from ʿImrān Ibn Hittān al-Khārijī, and ʿImrām ibn Hittān isn’t from the laymen of the Khawārij, he is not a “nobody” from the Khawārij, rather he is as al-Hāfidh ibn Hajr (رحمه الله) said in Hidāyat al-Sārī in the introduction of Fath al-Bārī, he says about him: “He is from the heads of the Khawārij, their Muftī, their Judge, and their poet”, this is ʿImrān Ibn Hittān, yet despite this, Imām al-Bukhārī (رحمه الله) narrated from him in his book “al-Sahīh”, yet he didn’t narrate

from anyone among the Murji'ah.

So ponder over the situation and reality of the Salaf, and their comparison between the Manhaj of the Khawārij, despite its misguidance and corruption, compared to the Manhaj of the Murji'ah.

Likewise, from the sayings that have been narrated from the great Imām Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī (رحمه الله), is that he said to one of his students (i.e. Maymūn ibn Abī Hamzah), he said to him: “Do not invite this cursed one to enter upon me, since he has spoken Irjā’”, Who does he intend by this? He intends Hammād Ibn Abī Sulaymān. Do you guys know who is Hammād? He is the Shaykh of Imām Abū Hanīfah al-Nu'mān (رحمه الله), Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī (رحمه الله) says about him (i.e. Hammād): “Do not invite this cursed one to enter upon me, since he has spoken Irjā’”, Ya'nī when he adopted the Madhab of the Murji'ah.

Likewise, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī (رحمه الله) says, when some of his students asked him (i.e. Abū Hamza al-Tammār), he said to him: “Who are the Murji'ah”, he (i.e. Ibrāhīm) replied: “Awā! Roll up this speech, for I fear upon the Millāh (i.e. Religion) from them, I fear for them (i.e. Their evil) upon the Ummah of the Muslimīn, their evil is so much! So you must be warned from them.”

I say, May Allāh have mercy upon him, so imagine if he lived in our times and saw their immense great evil widespread everywhere, Walā Hawla Walā Quwata ilā Billāh.

Likewise Imām Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī (رحمه الله) says: “The Murji'ah left the religion flimsier than a very thin garment”, so these are some of the statements of Imām Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī (رحمه الله).

Imām Mālik (رحمه الله) was asked about a man who is upon the Madhab of the Murji'ah, so he (i.e. Mālik) said: “Do not marry (anyone) to him” i.e. if he comes to ask for your daughters or sisters hand or those who you are guardians over, “Then do not marry (anyone) to him”, as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: “If a person with good character and Dīn comes to you, then marry him” (note: Hadīth has been criticised and weakened by several Muhaddīthīn), so Imām Mālik (رحمه الله), the Imām of Dār al-Hijrah [i.e. Al-Madīnah] isn't pleased with his character or Dīn [i.e. The Murji'].

Likewise, Imām Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah (رحمه الله), who passed away in the year 199AH said: “As for the Murji'ah who say that Ēmān is without action...”, ponder over these [words], he's speaking about the Murji'at al-Fuqahā' [That say Ēmān is belief and speech, excluding only action], and not the Ghulat al-Murji'ah [Who say Ēmān is only belief, excluding speech and

action], he (i.e. Sufyān Ibn ‘Uyaynah) says: “As for the Murji’ah who say that Ēmān is without action, then do not marry them, and do not eat with them, and do not drink with them, and do not associate with them, and do not pray with them, and do not pray upon them”.

That is why when the Janāzah [Funeral Prayer] was held for one of the Imāms who adopted the [‘Aqīdah] of Irjā’, who is Mus’ar ibn Kidār, the narrator said: “I did not see in it [i.e. the funeral prayer] Sufyān al-Thawrī or Sharīk ibn ‘Abdillāh al-Qādhī (the judge)”, they did not used to pray over the Murji’ah just as they did not used to respond to their Salāms as it has been shown from the actions of Sa’īd ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله), and likewise Ibrāhīm al-Nakha’ī (رحمه الله), when Ibrāhīm al-Taymī passed by him and gave him Salāms, he (i.e. Ibrāhīm al-Nakha’ī) didn’t respond to his Salāms due to his Irjā’. So Sufyān Ibn ‘Uyaynah (رحمه الله) orders to exile those Murji’ah.

Likewise, Imām Sufyān al-Thawrī (رحمه الله), a student of his (i.e. Muhammad Ibn Yūsuf) came to him, he entered upon his Shaykh, i.e. Sufyān al-Thawrī (رحمه الله), this mountain and Imām in Knowledge! He came to him with the Mushaf in his lap, and he is going past the pages of the Mushaf and is reading from it, and he says: “There is no one further away from this (i.e. the Qur’ān) than the Murji’ah”, Ya’nī don’t tell me this and that deviant sect, the most furthest deviant sect from the book of Allah is the Murji’ah, this is not my statement or the statement of Fulān and Fulān, but rather it’s the statement of the outstanding masters of the Scholars from the Salaf of the Ummāh.

And this Imām al-A’mash (رحمه الله), i.e. Sulaymān ibn Mahrān, he takes an oath and says: “By Allāh, in who there’s no deity worthy of worship except him, I did not see anyone more evil than the Murji’ah”, who is the one taking the oath? Imām Sulaymān ibn Mahrān (i.e. Al-A’mash) who the Imām have agreed upon narrating from him, and many Imāms of Hadīth were students of his, some of whom we mentioned previously such as Sufyān al-Thawrī (رحمه الله).

And this Imām al-Mughīrah al-Tabbī (رحمه الله), he also takes an oath and says: “By Allāh, in who there’s no deity worthy of worship except Him, the Murji’ah and the evil of the Murji’ah for this religion is greater than the evil of the Fussāq”. Ponder over most of the Fussāq and sinners today, how they love the people of Haqq and they love the Haqq, even though they aren’t portrayed to be among the people of the Haqq. Just as it has been said: “I love the Righteous, but I’m not from them”, so Imām al-Mughīrah (رحمه الله) says: The Fitna of the Murji’ah is more severe than the Fitna of the Fussāq upon this religion (i.e. Islām).

Likewise, Imām al-Awzā’ī (رحمه الله) narrates from Imām al-Zuhrī (رحمه الله) that he said: “I did not

see from the people of desires an evil like the Murji'ah", and likewise Imām al-Awzā'ī (رحمه الله) narrates from Imām Yahyā Ibn Abī Kathīr (رحمه الله) and Qatādah ibn Da'ām al-Sadūsī (رحمه الله), that they both said: "There's nothing more evil upon this Ummāh according to them (i.e. Salaf) than the Murji'ah".

So these are the sayings of the Imāms of the Salaf, where they have agreed upon maligning Irjā' and its people. And as we mentioned, some of them did not used to pray over them, infact some of them did not accept the Shahādah (testimony) of a Murji', such as Sharīk al-Qādhī (رحمه الله), and some of them did not used to speak to the Murji'ah, that was mentioned by Imām Hishām ibn 'Ammār (رحمه الله), he said: "I met Shihāb (i.e. Ibn Khirāsh al-Shaybānī who is one of the Imāms), and I wanted him to speak with me...", so what did the Imām Shihāb (رحمه الله) say? He told him:

"As long as you're not a Qadarī or Murji', I would speak to you, otherwise I wouldn't", Imām Hishām (رحمه الله) said: "I have nothing to do with these (2 sects) at all".

So the Salaf used to ask their students on their stance on the Murji'ah and the Qadariyyah, he said: "if you were Qadarī or Murji', I wouldn't speak to you, however if you were not (from amongst them) I would (speak to you)", so this is the stance/position of the Salaf, may Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) be pleased with them.

Imām al-Zuhrī (رحمه الله) said: "No deviance was innovated after the advent of Islam more harmful to its people than Irjā'"

Likewise, what the Salaf used to do, on top of not praying over the Murji'ah is that, listen to this position/stance and be aware, from this Imām al-Jalīl who is Imām 'Abdul Razzāq al-San'ānī (رحمه الله), the author of the Kitāb "al-Musannaf" in Hadīth. While some of his students were in his gathering, this Imām was informed about some news that 'Abdul Majīd passed away, so Imām 'Abdul Razzāq (رحمه الله) said: "Alhamdulillah to the one (i.e. Allāh) who has finished the Ummah of Islām from this Murji'", do you guys know who 'Abdul Majīd is? He is the son of 'Abdul 'Azīz Ibn Abī Rāwid, he was despite his Irjā' from those that worshipped Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) the most and from the sincere pious masters (i.e. Zāhid), they would give preference to him in "Zuhd" over Imām al-Wakī' ibn al-Jarrāh (رحمه الله).

Imām al-Dhahabī (رحمه الله) says, "Yet despite this, Imām Wakī' was given precedence in al-Zuhd because of his authority (i.e. Great Status) in the sunnah", he was given precedence over 'Abdul Majīd ibn 'Abdul 'Azīz despite his (great) Zuhd due to his Irjā', because he's a Murji' he was postponed, and that "Sunnī" was given precedence.

So this is some of the sayings of the Salaf regarding Irjā' and the Murji'ah, and Alhamdulillah with the blessing and permission of Allāh, I was able to debate some of the Murji'ah, the Sūfiyyāh, Ibādiyyah, Ashā'irah, even some of the Rāfidah and Jews, and I did not see any weaker Hujjah being used as proof for their Madhab than the Murji'ah. I swear by Allāh that their madhab is weaker than the spider web!

Now, we'll mention an important point which a group of Murji'ah in our times call the believers Khawārij for, and it's the issue of "Are those who rebel against the Ruler from the Khawarij?"

The issue of revolting against the unjust ruler is something the people of Ahlus-Sunnah have differed over, the revolt against a Muslim ruler, not against a {Kāfir} ruler, it's consensus that you can revolt against him [the ruler that disbelieves] this consensus was mentioned by several Scholars, and amongst those who mentioned it was Al-Qādhī 'Iyādh (رحمه الله), Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajr (رحمه الله), Imām al-Nawawī (رحمه الله) and many others, May Allāh (سبحانه وتعالى) have mercy upon them.

A group of the companions of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), revolted against the rulers of their time, Talhā Ibn 'Ubaydullāh (رضي الله عنه) rebelled against the ruler and he is one of the 10 that received the promise of attaining Jannāh in their lifetime. Al-Zubayr Ibn Al-'Awwām (رضي الله عنه) rose against the ruler and he is also one of the 10 who gained the promise of Jannāh in their lifetime.

The mother of the believers 'Ā'isha (رضي الله عنها) spoke against the rulers, and it is narrated that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in [Sunan] al-Tirmidhī (رحمه الله) that she will be his wife in Jannāh.

Al-Hussein Ibn 'Alī (رضي الله عنه) rebelled against Yazīd, and he and his brother are the leaders of the youth in Jannāh, Mu'āwiyah Ibn Abī Sufyān (رضي الله عنه) rebelled against the ruler, Al-Nu'mān Bashīr rebelled against the Umayyads, may Allah be pleased with him.

Several Companions of the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم), rebelled against the ruler of their time, has anyone said that they are Khawārij? Will you keep in mind that they received the glad tidings of Jannāh, has anyone said anything about them? Will someone dare to say anything about them? As they are the people of truth and refuge in Allah is sought by them. They are the dogs of hellfire? Will someone dare to say that?

The Tābi'īn (successors) revolted against the rulers, a group of the Tābi'īn revolted against the ruler of their time, amongst them was 'Abdullāh (رحمه الله), a son of a man who was washed by the angels, who on the night of his marriage, he was with his wife when he heard the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saying “..O horse riders of Allāh! Rise on your horses..” he went out from his wife and did not wash himself, and he was killed in the battle, and the angels washed him between the heaven and the earth, his son 'Abdullāh (رحمه الله) revolted against the Ummayyads.

'Abdullāh Ibn a-Zubayr (رحمه الله), the son of the companion of the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم), his mother is Asmā' [Bint Abī Bakr] the woman of two the belts, his grandmother through his father is the paternal aunt of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) - Saffiyah, his grandfather through his mother is Abū Bakr (رضي الله عنه), his aunt is the mother of the believers, 'Ā'isha (رضي الله عنها).

'Abdullāh Ibn al-Zubayr (رضي الله عنه) also rebelled against the Ummayyad King. Just as the people of Madīnah came out against their ruler, as well as the people of Al-Basra rebelled against their rulers, as told by Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajr (رحمه الله), the jurist of Al-Basra revolted against the rulers, the Imām Al-Sha'bī (رحمه الله) rebelled, Imām Ibn Abī Nitūr (رحمه الله) revolted, the Imām Sa'īd Ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله) rebelled and others amongst them rebelled against the rulers of their time, he came out and supported those who rebelled against the 'Abbāsids, with money and young people.

The Imām Abū Hanīfah Al-Nu'mān (رحمه الله), he said regarding those who got killed by revolting against 'Abbāsids such as Al-Mansūr Abī Ja'far, he (i.e. Abū Hanīfah) said {“..It is like they got shot on the day of Badr..”} he [also] said {“..Woe to me that I wasn't in his place..”}. The same applies to Imām Mālik (رحمه الله), when he was asked about the permissibility of revolting against Al-Mansūr in 145H he allowed the revolt, they told him {“..We pledged allegiance, we have alliance to our neck with him [the ruler]..”}, He [Imām Mālik] said “..rather you were forced, and there is no allegiance on the forced one...”. Imām Mālik (رحمه الله) gave a legal opinion on this matter, the same for Imām al-Shāfi'ī (رحمه الله) in his old school of law, he sees the permissibility to revolt against a tyrannical ruler.

Imām Ahmad (رحمه الله), which many of the contemporary speak about and try to include him in their beliefs and fundamentals, they say that they are part of the Hanbalī school of thought, the Imām Ahmad – may Allah have Mercy on him – in his time Imām Ahmad Ibn Nasr al-Khuzā'ī (رحمه الله) rebelled against the ruler of his time, he rebelled with the sword and fought till he was killed. When they killed Imām Ahmad Ibn Nasr al-Khuzā'ī (رحمه الله) as mentioned by Imām Ibn Kathīr in Al-Bidāyah Wa-Nihāyah, “Imām Ahmad wept over him, and it was very sad for him,

and this made him sad for a long time..”, and he said {“..may Allāh have Mercy upon him, he certainly fought with his soul in the path of Allāh..”}.

Ponder over the lessons of Imām Ahmad (رحمه الله) about rebelling against the ruler in his time, he said {“..may Allāh have Mercy upon him, he certainly fought with his soul in the path of Allāh..”}, are they capable of this those who join falsehood and wrong inside the school of law of Imām Ahmad today? Are they able to say those who rebel against one of these rulers, are they able to say of the rebellion said “..may Allāh have Mercy upon him, he certainly fought with his soul in the path of Allāh..”, or do they say, “..they are lost..”, “..they are amongst the dogs of the hellfire..”, and “..If it was not the fear of receiving the reproach of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), I would have killed them..”, so weigh between the two types of law. Fiqh of the Salaf, and Fiqh of the Khalaf [which joins falsehood and wrong inside the Fiqh of Salaf].

If you join a people who have honour we say, [poem] You are right but what a bad childbirth, and the sermon on which it is based is not evident, and the children sermon have monopolised it. So here is the case of Imām Ahmad, and there are cases of others in the Ummah, Imām Abū Al-‘Arab Al-Tamīmī (رحمه الله), rebelled against the ruler of his time, in the Islamic Maghrib, he is the author of the book “Al-Mihān”, he died in the year 333AH, but before that Imām Al-Jadda (رحمه الله) rebelled against the rulers of his time. And amongst them we see the permissibility of rising against the unjust ruler is the Imām Ibn Hazm (رحمه الله), he did an explanation in his book ‘Al-Fisal Fil-Milal wa-Nihal’, others who see the permissibility in Islām – Imām Al-Ghazzālī (رحمه الله) who died in 505AH, Imām Ibn Al-Jawzī (رحمه الله) amongst the Hanābilah and Ibn Al-Razil (رحمه الله), Imām Ibn ‘Aqīl (رحمه الله) who is from the Hanābilah and other than them amongst the ‘Ulemā’ of Islām see the permissibility of revolting against a Fāsiq (corrupt) ruler.

So no one who rebel against any ruler at any time is considered a Khawārij, this is not the criterion to judge an individual if he is part of a school of Khawārij or not. This is not the way of the people of Sunnah and consensus and this is not the criterion that was known at the time of the Salaf, May Allāh be pleased with them all.

Therefore a Sunnī can revolt against the ruler and the innovator, as well as the Shī’a can revolt against the ruler, the Khawārij rebelled against the ruler and even the Murji’ah rebelled. Some Murji’ah that were contemporary to the Salaf as Dharr Al-Hamadānī, the Scholars [of the Salaf] warned against him, Sa’īd Ibn Jubayr (رحمه الله) did not give Salāms to him because of his Irjā’, he warned against him because of his Irjā’.

The Imām Ibrāhīm Al-Nakhaṭī (رحمه الله), was an Imām who rebelled against Al-Hajjāj and also


warned against Dharr Al-Hamadānī because of his Irjā', and yet he saw permissibility to affiliate with the Murji'ah in rebelling against Al-Hajjāj by the sword, this is the Murji'ah that were contemporary to the Salaf and this shows that anyone who rise against the ruler is not qualified as what? As being part of the Khawārij. You will find a democrat revolting, a secular rebel, a communist, rises against the ruler, the secularist revolts also, these people are disbelievers, so are they fitting the legal condition of a Khawārij?


No one who rebels against the ruler is considered a part of the Khawārij but it is essential that he adheres to the principles of the Khawārij that was mentioned to you in this lesson, for which I ask Allah – The Exalted and Glorified - to bless and it is through this you will find that the accusation is invalid and it would be fair to say regarding the Murji'ah affiliated {"They are the Murji'ah with the rulers and the Sultān and Khawārij with the preachers and Mujāhidīn"}

CONCLUSION:

So this is basically what you need to know about the Murji'ah of our time, and their false beliefs which they attribute towards our beloved Salaf, whereas our beloved Salaf are free from their evil. What's astonishing is that you'll find many characteristics of the Khawārij apply in accordance upon the contemporary Murji'ah when dealing with preachers and Mujāhidīn, and they are Murji'ah when dealing with the rulers and Sultān. As for the Murji'ah of our time, they have limited all nullifiers of Islām to "Belief in the heart alone", so there's absolutely no difference between a person who commits a Nullifier of Islām or a Major Sin, both remain in the fold of Islām, unless he believes it to be permissible in the heart, and this is the Madhab of the Ghulāt al-Murji'ah, may Allāh guide us.

3 visits · 1 online

 Save as PDF

 Share